Public Involvement Evaluation Measures - Collected from the Literature

1. from Terry F. Yosie and Timothy D. Herbst"s Using Stakeholder Processes in Environmental Decision Making (September 1998)
Possible goals against which to measure:
Process (How well did it work to encourage.....?)
sharing of information
identification of issues and concerns
creation of new alternatives
empowerment of participants over decisions that affect their lives
procedures for information gathering
agreement on design for process
incorporation of public concerns and input into the decision making process
resolution of conflict
outcomes that fulfil legal/regulatory requirements
clear goals, process and planning (transparency to participants)
identification of stakeholders
diversity of views
"representativeness"
accessibility of information and technical information
ability to reach agreement for solving a specific problem
decision acceptability
project efficiency (cost avoidance)
"tangible, specific results within reasonable time frames and budgets"
accountability (of govt and/or industry)
good fit of process to problem
reduced stakeholder "burnout"
balance of focus and participation
Collaborative (How well did it produce.....?)
enhanced trust and credibility
relationship/alliance building
mutual respect
mutual learning
continuing education

2. From Dan Fiorino Citizen Participation and Environmental Risk: A Survey of Institutional Mechanisms Science, Technology and Human Values, Vol 15, No 2, Spring 1990
Criteria for participatory mechanisms:
allows direct participation of amateurs in decision making
enables citizens to participate in collective decision making
provides a structure for face-to face discussion over some period of time
offers citizens the opportunity to participate on some basis of equality with administrative officials and technical experts

3. Stakeholder Involvement & Public Participation at the US EPS - Lessons Learned, Barriers & Innovative Approaches Eric Marsh (January 2001)
integration of social and economic concerns

4. Public Involvement & Social Impact Assessment (Westview Press 1983)
participant satisfaction
degree to which participants' shared goals are achieved (satisfied)

5. Tom Beierle and Jerry Cayford, Public Participation in Environmental Decisions: Lessons from the Case Study Record, January 23, 2001 (Review Draft), Resources for the Future

Social goals

Incorporating public values into decisions
Increasing the substantive quality of decisions
Resolving conflict among competing interests
Building trust in institutions
Educating and informing the public

Process qualities

clear goals
clear roles
agency responsiveness
clear information
staff or other support (technical assistance)
participant power
participant motivations (personal goals)
capacity building
transparency
community building
relationship building

Outcomes

publicly acceptable decision
participants resolved conflicts
trust increased between government and participants
general public became better educated about the issue, more able to become involved in future activities
shared understandings and collective perception of solutions

Measures of the substantive quality of decisions:

cost effectiveness - were the participants' decisions/recommendations more or less cost effective than a probable alternative?
joint gains - were some participants better off with none worse?
opinion - were people more satisfied with the decision?
added information - did participants add information to the analysis which was otherwise not available?
technical analysis - did participants engage in technical analyses to improve the foundation on which their decisions were made?
innovative ideas - did participants generate innovative ideas or creative solutions?
holistic approach – did participants introduce more holistic and integrated ways to examine environmental problems?
other - was the decision based on good science; good technical information; was the decision fair; was it more economically and/or socially viable; did the decision produce more environmentally beneficial outcomes; did the learning extend beyond participants to the general public?

6. Caron Chess from Evaluating Environmental Public Participation: Methodological Questions in Journal of Environmental Planning and Management 43(6), 769-784, 2000

Summative

further progress toward environmental results
change behavior
participant satisfaction
trust

Formative
degree of cooperation
comparisons of like efforts
quality of relationships
meeting effectiveness
perceptions of the sponsoring agency
quality of information provided
Impact
long term results of programs

7. From CBEP Evaluation of Community-based Environmental Protection Projects: Accomplishments and Lessons Learned

Value added by CBEP activities (related to some of the above but CBEP project focused)

- provide benefits in other policy areas - creates legitimacy for policies generated; - community buy-in influences behavior of local industrial facilities - Improved capacity to address multidisciplinary problems; - Integration of economic, social, environmental, and other quality of life priorities
- Improved linkages between departments with shared responsibilities - More positive image of EPA as a program partner and creative force
- Brings into focus differing viewpoints toward environmental problems and other important issues that tend to be ignored by more conventional policy approaches - Placing residents in project roles can help overcome trust and credibility issues faced by traditional environmental and health risk reduction efforts - Behavior of regulated facilities positively affected by organized, knowledgeable community, creating better dialogue during permitting processes, etc. - EPA program offices oriented toward more integrated understanding of cross-media concerns facing communities - Collaborative process lays groundwork for further partnering and allows stakeholders to develop better relationships with one another and learn about different perspectives - Fostering collaborative efforts between neighboring cities - Impact on local and regional land use planning policies - Deeper understanding of impediments to brownfields development may aide regional and national policymaking - Community capacity building ensures long-term sustainability of results (e.g., Toolbox/ Information Guide) - Demonstrates smart growth by integrating land use planning with environmental and socioeconomic decision-making
- Fostering collaborative efforts between neighboring cities - Impact on local and regional land use planning policies - Deeper understanding of impediments to brownfields development may aide regional and national policymaking - Community capacity building ensures long-term sustainability of results (e.g., Toolbox/ Information Guide) - Demonstrates smart growth by integrating land use planning with environmental and socioeconomic decision-making

- Fostering collaborative efforts between neighboring cities
- Impact on local and regional land use planning policies
- Deeper understanding of impediments to brownfields development may aide regional and national policymaking
- Community capacity building ensures long-term sustainability of results (e.g., Toolbox/ Information Guide)
- Demonstrates smart growth by integrating land use planning with environmental and socioeconomic decision-making